Ham-Policy Digest   Wed, 25 Aug 93   Volume 93 : Issue 306

Today's Topics:
                    Just Go Learn the code!
                    Just Go Learn the THEORY!
      Just go racing! (was Re: Just Go Learn the code!_ (2 msgs)
         STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
             Techs with HF, was Re: Novice testing rules?

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 24 Aug 1993 23:18:53 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!perry@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Just Go Learn the code!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Alan Harp (harp@bnr.ca) wrote:
: Her name is Laura, Her call is KD4OZC.

: What's great is last Saturday she took the test for General. Guess what
: at the code test she PASSED 20WPM. She is now only 9 years old. She
: lacks a few QSLs from having DXCC. She hopes to have here DXCC before
: she is 10.

If I've grepped the callsign database correctly, the youngest Extra is
either 10 (or 110 :-) years old. I think the Advanced and Extra written
tests are pretty awesome for someone that age. Good luck to her.

Perry Scott
AA0ET

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, harp@bnr.ca (Alan Harp) writes...

>The daughter of a friend of mine here in Raleigh (NO0T/VE3FIB Paul Sobon)
>got her novice/tech lisense a little over a year ago at the age of 8.
>
>Her name is Laura, Her call is KD4OZC.

>What's great is last Saturday she took the test for General. Guess what
>at the code test she PASSED 20WPM. She is now only 9 years old. She
>lacks a few QSLs from having DXCC. She hopes to have here DXCC before
>she is 10.

My son is nine and his name is Ian. He's very good at basic algebra.

A few weeks ago I got out the DMM (digital multi meter) and wired up
a 12VDC circuit of several light bulbs in series and parallel. I showed
him how in a series circuit, current is constant while voltage adds to
equal the source and the opposite occurs in parallel circuits. We then
played with simple resistor networks. We used the DMM to confirm our
predicted results using simple algebra.

I figured a little "hands-on" demonstration of real-world examples of
electronic theory couldn't hurt as long as he is studying for his
technician class license. I explained to him the importance of
experimentation and understanding HOW and WHY something works rather
than just memorizing the answers or the pattern of the questions and
answers (since both are publicized for amateur radio exams).

"What's great" is he seemed to appreciate the time I spent with him
explaining the reasons behind those publicized questions and answers
rather than me just quizzing him over and over and over again till
he simply memorized the test. I said he could go ahead and memorize
the answers if he wanted to (told him I'd even help him), but he said
he'd rather we continue with the demos!

>The Advanced and Extra theory tests look pretty awsome to her right now
>but I'll bet she'll knock them off within two more years. Maybe less.

College sophomore level network analysis looks a little difficult to
my son right now, but I'll bet he'll "knock it off" soon enough.
Anyway, it'll look a hell of a lot better on a resume than 20WPM
Morse code. ;-)

While the the commercial RF world is leaving amateur radio operators
in the dust, we still continue to make "code" the most talked about,
the most tested and the most over-rated aspect of amateur radio.
Keep it up boys, and we'll loose the spectrum even faster!

BTW, if I see any more photos of oversized, polished cheerywood or
otherwise "glorified" keys in QST magazine I'm gonna puke! Not to
mention "CW motorcycle mobile", scuba CW, parachute CW, packhorse CW,
toilet seat CW or any other method of guilding the lilly that they've
not yet managed to cover. Of all the things to spend time on! I'm
gonna have to cancel my subscription.

--
Kevin Jessup, N9SQB "A bad day of DXing is better than a good day at work."

          The U.S. Constitution defines the rights the people
                 give to the government, not the reverse!

Date: Tue, 24 Aug 93 18:53:06 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Just go racing! (was Re: Just Go Learn the code!_
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Aug24.040809.126607@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H.
Myers) writes:
>Virtually every person I've met that was licensed under the age of 12
>did so because their parent(s) was an avid amateur operator. Without
>going into details, I'd like to observe that nearly every ham I
>remember being licensed under the age of 12 let the license expire as
>the young person developed interests of their own, rather than
>echoing the interests of their parent(s).

Data point: I was first licensed at 10. My father was (and is) a ham, but he'd
been inactive for a couple of years. Yes, that ticket expired - but I got
relicensed three years later after looking at the stack of QSLs I'd received,
and remembered how much fun it was making the contacts that earned them.

How do I fit into your stereotype? Beats me.

>Shucks, Alan, I have an Extra. I learned the code, too. I even use

>it. However, I still think the 13 and 20 WPM requirements are obsolete
>based on objective reasons rather than the Bo/Nike school of "Just do it".

There are lots of things in the "just do it" category, most of which are
accepted and vehemently supported even by those who vehemently oppose any sort
of code requirement. Do you support requirements that people study history,
English, and other unrelated subjects in order to get a degree in electrical
engineering? How are those different from code requirements for a ham license?
I claim that the exact arguments you raise against code requirements apply
equally to "core curriculum" requirements in college.
--
Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
                    "iHaTeX." -- Andrew Burt

Date: Tue, 24 Aug 93 18:46:34 GMT
From: ncrgw2.ncr.com!ncrhub2!torynews!kevin@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Just go racing! (was Re: Just Go Learn the code!_
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Aug24.040809.126607@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H.
Myers) writes:
>
>Virtually every person I've met that was licensed under the age of 12
>did so because their parent(s) was an avid amateur operator. Without
>going into details, I'd like to observe that nearly every ham I
>remember being licensed under the age of 12 let the license expire as
>the young person developed interests of their own, rather than
>echoing the interests of their parent(s).
>

Oh boy, this reminded me of when I took my Advanced test 9 months ago or
so. Out in the parking lot I heard the sound of practice CW coming from
a parked vehicle. It was occupied by a woman and her daughter, around age
9 or 10 I think. I tried to talk to the little girl but her mother
wouldn't let her get a word in edgewise. Turns out the little girl was
skipping gymnastics to come to the test, and she didn't look too happy about
it.

To make a long story short, I think the girl failed every test element she
took, in fact as soon as her mother left the room she just drew pictures on
her CW copy sheet and copied nothing. I hope her mother didn't beat her
when they got home, or lock her in a room with a CW practice tape at very
loud volume :-(

I'm not trying to say folks shouldn't try to get their kids interested in

ham radio, or that the original poster has abused his kids in any way;
but we need to be sensitive to our kid's need to *be kids* and if they
have other interests besides ham radio we should not be offended.

```
--
[]  []  [][]    [][]    Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ                NCR Torrey Pines
[] []   [] []  []       kevin.sanders@torreypinesca.ncr.com   (619) 597-3602
[][]    [][]    [][]    kevin%beacons@cyber.net
[] []   [] []      []
[]  []  []  []  [][]    Dump MS-DOS.   Prevent Programmer Burnout with Linux.
```

Date: 24 Aug 93 22:40:47 GMT
From: rtech!ingres!garys@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Aug23.151612.11617@news.unomaha.edu>, ncc2001@cwis.unomaha.edu
(Michael Fortner) writes:
>Well, if you are waiting for your call to come in, 13 seems to be the lucky
>number. After 13 weeks, my call _finally_ came in. Now I can be set loose
>on the airwaves. ;)
>
>It was a long wait, so don't mug the mailman, he might be carrying mace! :)
>
>
>--
>| Michael Fortner   N0YBC   * "I've got all this love to give and |
>| ncc2001@cwis.unomaha.edu   *   so far all I have is my ham radio" |
>| "What do you mean, pop quiz?" *   -Selma Bouvier |

I guess I'll have to wait till around xmas - since I just passed my general.
Someone told me that the FCC is planning on hooking up to the VEC exam sites
to speed up the process.

-garys

Date: Tue, 24 Aug 1993 23:29:21 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!perry@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Techs with HF, was Re: Novice testing rules?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

sohl,william h (whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com) wrote:
: And, if the now "coded tech" never upgrades beyond that, the only proof

: of the upgrade is the 5wpm CSCE issued at the time the 5 wpm test
: was passed.

I feel the whole CSCE scheme is unenforceable as a practical matter.
Can an OO get a list of HF-capable Techs? How many pounds does it
weigh? :-)

Perry Scott
AA0ET

Date: Wed, 25 Aug 1993 02:21:51 GMT
From: swrinde!emory!kd4nc!n4tii@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <25apvc$ggm@zephyr.ens.tek.com>, <1993Aug24.031323.13221@kd4nc.uucp>,
<25df23$3mf@zephyr.ens.tek.com>
Subject : Re: Bootlegger At ARRL N.E. Convention

ronk@cascade.ens.tek.com (Ron Kirkpatrick) writes:

>In article <1993Aug24.031323.13221@kd4nc.uucp>, n4tii@kd4nc.uucp (John Reed)
writes:
>|> ronk@cascade.ens.tek.com (Ron Kirkpatrick) writes:
>|>
>|> >Actually John, you don't need a HAM license. If you are in CAP you can get
into
>|> >the MARS program through your Wing/Region DC (Director of Communications).
The
>|> >Air Force Liason (sp) Office hold the actual license and unit numbers are
>|> >issued against that license. Much like the fleet licenses CAP holds for the
>|> >other radios frequencies.
>|>
>|> But you can't get on the normal traffic nets...you can only participate in
>|> joint exercises and stuff....I couldn't check into the 2s1 net as AGC2GA Unit
1
>|> and handle traffic...(at least that is how I interpret the rules....in both
>|> the cap comms manual and the MODS) Please correct me if I'm wrong.
>|>
>|> Thanks...
>|>
>|> (BTW, how do I do the capital thing....I sent mail to you an alan painter,
>|> but I think I only went direct and not thru the feed)
>|>

>If you have been issued a MARS call sign (even if it is a Unit designation),

>you can check into the nets. You are not allowed to handle traffic until you
>have completed the MARS training. If you can tell me which paragraphs in either
>the MODS (Mars Operating DirectiveS) and/or CAP manualls, I will review them.

>Just as a reminder there was a writeup in the CAP NEWS (the monthly National
>news paper) about a unit in the midwest that handled Health and Wellfare
>traffic as a MARS station during Desert Storm.

"I did not know that." - Johnny Carson

Ok, the thing on the MARS/CAP thing is : CAPM100-1 section 24-3 . There's
a whole mess on it. OK...I read that a person can check in to send and
receive CAP related traffic. As far as checking in and handling 'MARSGRAMS'
I don't think CAP can do it...(Although I took a piece of traffic off 2s1 and
went to my CAP net and handled to a CAP station in albany who passed it for me.)
OK....check in your MODS, the new blue ones...Chapter 3 is all about CAP
and AFMARS support...

Please follow up with this in Email, as we don't want the whole world to know
what we're up to! (grin)

CUL es 73 de John
N4TII - AFA2FH - REDSTAR 207

n4tii%kd4nc.uucp@gatech.edu

>The address for the capital distribution list is: capital@cps.udayton.edu.
>Be aware that there are a number of invalid addresses currently in the list.

>--
>Ron Kirkpatrick
>News Administrator/Postmaster
>Tektronix, Inc
>503-627-6707

Date: Wed, 25 Aug 93 02:36:07 GMT
From: netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!
dana@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <harp.11.0@bnr.ca>, <1993Aug24.040809.126607@locus.com>,
<1993Aug24.185306.4709@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>o.la
Subject : Re: Just go racing! (was Re: Just Go Learn the code!_

In article <1993Aug24.185306.4709@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu> jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu (Jay
Maynard) writes:

```
>
>>Shucks, Alan, I have an Extra.  I learned the code, too.  I even use
>>it.  However, I still think the 13 and 20 WPM requirements are obsolete
>>based on objective reasons rather than the Bo/Nike school of "Just do it".
>
>There are lots of things in the "just do it" category, most of which are
>accepted and vehemently supported even by those who vehemently oppose any sort
>of code requirement. Do you support requirements that people study history,
>English, and other unrelated subjects in order to get a degree in electrical
>engineering? How are those different from code requirements for a ham license?
>I claim that the exact arguments you raise against code requirements apply
>equally to "core curriculum" requirements in college.

Certainly I can see the objective reasoning behind breadth requirements
in college.  Some colleges offer electives which are of little general
use, such as Latin or, say, basketweaving.  These electives may be
interesting to some, but are electives, not requirements.

My reading of Part 97 and common sense suggest that amateur radio
examinations should emphasize the knowledge and skills which are
of general value to the US.  If there are other skills of use to
an individual, such as CW, then these should be permitted in the
service but not required.

In other words, now that CW is falling out of common use in the commercial,
military, and marine radio worlds, we need to find out what is valuable
in a core of reserve radio operators and technicians, and emphasize
it.  CW is a neat little thing that was once a requirement to be a radio
operator in most services.  Now, it is a relic.  If hams want to use it,
great.  If some folks still use Latin, wonderful.  But, a EE doesn't
need to know Latin, and a radio operator today really doesn't need CW.

--
 * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ       | Views expressed here are  *
 * (310) 337-5136       | mine and do not necessarily    *
 * dana@locus.com  DoD #466      | reflect those of my employer
     *
 * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

-----------------------------

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #306
*****************************
```